

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 were previously pending in this patent application. Claims 1-37 stand rejected. Herein, Claims 1, 10, 18, 20, 30, and 32 have been amended. Support for the amendments is found on page 28 of the Specification. Accordingly, after this Amendment and Response After Final Action, Claims 1-37 remain pending in this patent application. Further examination and reconsideration in view of the claims, remarks, and arguments set forth below is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, 15-20, 22, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low-Power Video Encoder/Decoder Chip Set for Digital VCR's" by Hasegawa et al. (hereafter Hasegawa) in view of Hamadani et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845,083 (hereafter Hamadani). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites (as amended):

A method of processing digital video data for displaying, said method comprising the steps of:

- a) preparsing said digital video data to recover a decoding order of said digital video data;
- b) while preparsing said digital video data, decoding a variable length coding format of said preparsed digital video data; and
- c) while decoding said variable length coding format of said preparsed digital video data, decompressing said decoded digital video data to facilitate displaying said digital video data on an electronic display device, wherein ***said preparsing and said decompressing are performed according to time sharing criteria such that said decompressing is halted while performing said preparsing and***

such that said preparsing is halted while performing said decompressing. (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani does not teach, motivate, or suggest the present invention as recited in Independent Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 1 recites the limitation," wherein ***said preparsing and said decompressing are performed according to time sharing criteria such that said decompressing is halted while performing said preparsing and such that said preparsing is halted while performing said decompressing,***" (emphasis added). In the Final Office Action (at page 2), it is stated that Hasegawa shows unpacking process is performed while the VLD is being performed, wherein the unpacking process is intended to refer to the "parsing" of Independent Claim 1. Moreover, it is argued in the Final Office Action (at page 3) that Hamadani teaches a decoder allowing the VLD and decompression to operate simultaneously. Further, in the Advisory Action (at continuation of 11), it is stated that since Hasegawa and Hamadani each teach decompression units being performed simultaneously the requirement for time sharing is satisfied. In particular, it is said, "As it is obvious that in order to perform two or more tasks simultaneously you are in fact time sharing."

However, there is no discussion that Hasegawa and Hamadani (individually or in combination) teach, motivate, or suggest the preparsing and the decompressing are performed according to time sharing criteria such that the

decompressing is halted while performing the preparsing and such that the preparsing is halted while performing the decompressing, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Moreover, even if Hasegawa and Hamadani each teach decompression units being performed simultaneously, the requirement for time sharing is not satisfied since Hasegawa and Hamadani fail to teach, motivate, or suggest the preparsing and the decompressing are performed according to time sharing criteria such that the decompressing is halted while performing the preparsing and such that the preparsing is halted while performing the decompressing, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1.

As described above, the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani fails to teach, motivate, or suggest all claim limitations of Independent Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani and is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2, 3, and 6-8 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 2, 3, and 6-8 are patentable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claims 10 and 18, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 10 and 18 recite similar limitations as in Independent

Claim 1. In particular, Independent Claim 10 recites the limitation," wherein ***said parsing and said decompressing are performed according to time sharing criteria such that said decompressing is halted while performing said parsing and such that said parsing is halted while performing said decompressing,***" (emphasis added). Moreover, Independent Claims 18 recites the limitation, "wherein ***said processor halts decompressing said digital video data while parsing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria, and wherein said processor halts parsing said digital video data while decompressing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria,***" (emphasis added). As discussed above, the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani fails to teach, motivate, or suggest the cited claim limitations. Therefore, Independent Claims 10 and 18 are patentable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 11, 12, and 15-17 and Dependent Claims 19, 20, 22, 28, and 29 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 10 and 18, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 11, 12, 15-17, 19, 20, 22, 28, and 29 are patentable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low-Power Video Encoder/Decoder Chip Set for Digital VCR's" by Hasegawa et al. (hereafter Hasegawa) in view of Hamadani et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845,083 (hereafter Hamadani), and in view of Washington, U.S. Patent No. 6,389,171 (hereafter Washington). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claim 9 is dependent on allowable Independent Claim 1, which is allowable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani. Moreover, Washington fails to teach, motivate, or suggest the preparsing and the decompressing are performed according to time sharing criteria such that the decompressing is halted while performing the preparsing and such that the preparsing is halted while performing the decompressing, as in the invention of Independent Claim 1. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Washington for the reasons discussed above. Since Dependent Claim 9 depends from Independent Claim 1, Dependent Claim 9 is patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Washington for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low-Power Video Encoder/Decoder Chip Set for Digital VCR's" by Hasegawa et al. (hereafter Hasegawa) in view of Hamadani et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845,083 (hereafter Hamadani), and in view of Peng et al., U.S.

Patent No. 6,496,199 (hereafter Peng). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 4 and 5, Dependent Claims 13 and 14, and Dependent Claim 27 are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18, respectively, which are allowable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani. Moreover, Peng fails to teach, motivate, or suggest the preparsing and the decompressing are performed according to time sharing criteria such that the decompressing is halted while performing the preparsing and such that the preparsing is halted while performing the decompressing, as in the invention of Independent Claims 1 and 10. Further, Peng fails to teach, motivate, or suggest, "wherein ***said processor halts decompressing said digital video data while preparsing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria, and wherein said processor halts preparsing said digital video data while decompressing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria,***" (emphasis added) as recited in Independent Claim 18. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 are patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Peng for the reasons discussed above. Since Dependent Claims 4 and 5, Dependent Claims 13 and 14, and Dependent Claim 27 depend from Independent Claims 1, 10, and 18, respectively, Dependent Claims 4 and 5, Dependent Claims 13 and 14, and Dependent Claim 27 are patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Peng for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 21, 23-26, 30-34, and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low-Power Video Encoder/Decoder Chip Set for Digital VCR's" by Hasegawa et al. (hereafter Hasegawa) in view of Hamadani et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845,083 (hereafter Hamadani), and in view of Jan, U.S. Patent No. 5,363,097 (hereafter Jan). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claims 21 and 23-26 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 18, which is allowable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani. Moreover, Jan fails to teach, motivate, or suggest, "wherein **said processor halts decompressing said digital video data while preparsing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria, and wherein said processor halts preparsing said digital video data while decompressing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria,**" (emphasis added) as recited in Independent Claim 18. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 18 is patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Jan for the reasons discussed above. Since Dependent Claims 21 and 23-26 depend from Independent Claim 18, Dependent Claims 21 and 23-26 are patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Jan for the reasons discussed above.

With respect to Independent Claim 30, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 30 recites similar limitations as in Independent Claim 1. In

particular, Independent Claim 30 recites the limitation, "wherein ***said processor halts decompressing said digital video data while preparsing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria, and wherein said processor halts preparsing said digital video data while decompressing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria,***" (emphasis added). Therefore, Independent Claim 30 is patentable over the combination of Hasegawa and Hamadani for reasons discussed in connection with Independent Claim 1.

Moreover, Jan does not teach, motivate or suggest, "wherein ***said processor halts decompressing said digital video data while preparsing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria, and wherein said processor halts preparsing said digital video data while decompressing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria,***" (emphasis added) as recited in Independent Claim 30. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 30 is patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Jan for the reasons discussed above.

Dependent Claims 31-34 and 36-37 are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 30, which is allowable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Jan. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claims 31-34 and 36-37 are patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Jan for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Low-Power Video Encoder/Decoder Chip Set for Digital VCR's" by Hasegawa et al. (hereafter Hasegawa) in view of Hamadani et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,845,083 (hereafter Hamadani), in view of Jan, U.S. Patent No. 5,363,097 (hereafter Jan), and further in view of Peng et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,496,199 (hereafter Peng). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Dependent Claim 35 is dependent on allowable Independent Claim 30, which is allowable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, and Jan. Moreover, Peng does not teach, motivate or suggest, "wherein ***said processor halts decompressing said digital video data while preparsing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria, and wherein said processor halts preparsing said digital video data while decompressing said digital video data according to time sharing criteria,***" (emphasis added) as recited in Independent Claim 30. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Independent Claim 30 is patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, Jan, and Peng for the reasons discussed above. Since Dependent Claim 35 depends from Independent Claim 30, it is respectfully submitted that Dependent Claim 35 is patentable over the combination of Hasegawa, Hamadani, Jan, and Peng for the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above claims, arguments, and remarks overcome all rejections. All remaining claims (Claims 1-37) are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited references. For at least the above-presented reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims (Claims 1-37) are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 2/06/2006

Jose S. Garcia

Jose S. Garcia
Registration No. 43,628

Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060